

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE JESUS AVALOS-AVILES,

No. 2:22-cv-01257-DAD-DB

Plaintiff,

v.

RED ROBIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE
CASES AND CONSOLIDATING CASES

Defendant.

NICHOLAS J. MCINERNY,

No. 2:23-cv-01548-DAD-DB

Plaintiff,

v.

RED ROBIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Defendant.

Before the court is the unopposed motion to consolidate cases filed by defendant Red Robin International, Inc. (“Red Robin”) on January 9, 2024 in *Avalos-Aviles v. Red Robin International, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-01257-DAD-DB. (Doc. No. 23.) Specifically, defendant Red Robin seeks to consolidate the following two related cases brought against it in this district:

////

////

- 1 • *Avalos-Aviles v. Red Robin International, Inc.* (No. 2:22-cv-01257-DAD-DB) (the
2 “*Avalos* action”); and
3 • *Nicholas J. McInerny v. Red Robin International Inc. et al.* (No. 2:23-cv-01548-
4 DAD-DB) (the “*McInerny* action”)

5 (*Id.*)

6 On January 26, 2024, plaintiff in the *Avalos* action filed a statement of non-opposition to
7 the pending motion. (*Avalos*, Doc. No. 24.) On February 2, 2024, the parties in the *McInterny*
8 action filed a joint status report, in which the parties state that they “met and conferred and
9 plaintiff, through his counsel, agreed he would not oppose consolidating his action with *Avalos*.¹
10 (*McInterny*, Doc. No. 31 at 3.) On February 5, 2024, the court took the pending motion under
11 submission on the papers. (*Avalos*, Doc. No. 25.)

12 Pursuant to Rule 42(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[i]f actions before the
13 court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or
14 all matters at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to
15 avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” In exercising its discretion, the court “weighs the saving of
16 time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it
17 would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984). Here, the court finds
18 that the actions involve the same or similar parties, claims, and questions of fact or law, and that
19 consolidation will avoid unnecessary costs and duplication of proceedings. Thus, good cause
20 exists to grant defendant’s unopposed motion to consolidate these cases.

21 Accordingly,

- 22 1. Defendant’s unopposed motion to consolidate cases (Doc. No. 23) is granted;
23 2. The above-referenced cases shall be consolidated for all purposes, including trial,
24 pursuant to Rule 42(a);
25 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to file this order in each of the above-referenced
26 cases; and

27 ////

28 ////

1 4. Going forward, the parties and the Clerk of the Court are directed to file
2 documents under only the lead case number. Future captions should indicate the
3 lead case number followed by the member case number as follows:

4 **Lead Case:** **2:22-cv-01257-DAD-DB**

5 **Member Case:** **2:23-cv-01548-DAD-DB**

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: February 8, 2024

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28